



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,632	08/19/2003	A. David Shay	17836-55730	7523
24728	7590	01/29/2007	EXAMINER	
MORRIS MANNING MARTIN LLP 3343 PEACHTREE ROAD, NE 1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER ATLANTA, GA 30326			PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2132				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/29/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/644,632	SHAY, A. DAVID
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Venkat Perungavoor	2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 14, 83-88, 96, 98-102, 128-130, 132-137, 153-158, 166, 168-172, 198-200, 202-206 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 7-13, 15, 89-95, 97, 131, 159-165, 167, 201 and 207 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/04, 8/03</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,5,6,14,16-20,83,87,88,96,98-102,128-130,132-136,153,166,168-172,198-200 and 202-206.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

The word "Length" is misspelled in Fig. 2B. Appropriate Correction is required.

### *Election/Restrictions*

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Independent Claims 1, 83, 128, 153, and all of their dependent claims respectively, drawn to a method of object protection, classified in class 713, subclass 167.
- II. Independent Claims 21, 103, 173, and all of their dependent claims respectively, drawn to an method of packet filtering, classified in class 726, subclass 13.
- III. Independent Claims 41, 123, 193, 208, and all of their dependent claims respectively, drawn to an method of packet header designating cryptographically protected data, classified in class 713, subclass 160.
- IV. Independent Claims 62, 71, and all of their dependent claims respectively, drawn to a method of authorizing data, classified in class 726, subclass 30.
- V. Independent Claims 144, 214, and all of their dependent claims respectively, drawn to a method of authorization, classified in class 726, subclass 21.

Inventions stated in Groups I-IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention relating to each of the methods does not require the use of the other recited in different groupings. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Groups II-V restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed( 37 CFR 1.143).

A telephone call was made to Attorney for the Applicants Mr. Jack Todd on 12/13/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, resulted in an election of Group I being made.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment to inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 14, 16-20, 83, 96, 98-102, 128-129, 130, 132, 153, 166, 168-172, 198-200, 202, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by US Patent 6772334 to Glawitsch in view of US Patent 5216675 to Melliar-Smith et al.(hereinafter Smith).

Regarding Claim 1, 83, 128, 153, 198, Glawitsch discloses the including an source identifier in the header see Col 3 Ln 8-34. But does not explicitly teaching the including

of user identifiers in the header. However, Smith discloses the adding of the identity of broadcasting processor in the header of the message see Col 10 Ln 39-48 & Abstract. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include user identifiers in the headers in the invention of Glawitsch in order to maintain an list of users as taught in Smith see Col 6 Ln 19-34. And further, Smith hints at the inclusion of source identifiers in the headers see Fig. 7, where the optional field's length is eight bits same as the destination address' length leaving room for source addresses which is also likely to be eight bits in length. And additionally, the inclusion of source addresses in headers well known in many protocols, e.g. TCP, IP.

Regarding Claim 14, 20, 96, 102, 130, 166, 172, 200, Glawitsch discloses the communication from source to destination by transmitting from source to destination an packet see Fig. 5, where the SYN packet is initially sent.

Regarding Claim 16, 98, 168, Glawitsch discloses the communication from source to destination by transmitting an ACK packet see Fig. 5.

Regarding Claim 17, 99, 132, 169, 202, Glawitsch discloses the MAC address being used for source identifiers see Col 5 Ln 48-60.

Regarding Claim 18, 100, 170, Glawitsch discloses the desktop computers being used see Col 1 Ln 23-29.

Regarding Claim 19, 101, 171, Glawitsch discloses the TCP/IP protocol being used see Col 6 Ln 23-34.

Regarding Claim 129, 199, Glawitsch discloses the extracting from header of packet see Col 6 Ln 8-16.

Claims 2, 84,154, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by US Patent 6772334 to Glawitsch in view of US Patent 5216675 to Melliar-Smith et al.(hereinafter Smith) further in view of US Patent 6671273 B1 to Beck.

Regarding Claim 2, 84, 154, Glawitsch nor Smith discloses the embedding of user identifier in the sequence number field. However, Beck discloses the encoded of an ID in the sequence field of the header see Col 5 Ln 49-63. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the encoded of an ID in the sequence field of the header in the invention of Glawitsch in order to an network layer identification of destination as taught in Beck see Col 3 Ln 42-50.

Claims 3-4, 85-86, 155-156, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by US Patent 6772334 to Glawitsch in view of US Patent 5216675 to Melliar-Smith et al.(hereinafter Smith) further in view of US 2002/0101332 to Talmadge et al.(hereinafter Talmadge).

Regarding Claim 3-4, 85-86, 155-156, Glawitsch nor Smith disclose the embedding identifiers in the acknowledgement field of the packet. However, Talmadge discloses the acknowledgement field containing the identification code identifying the source of request and containing an non-zero value see Par. 0017. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the acknowledgement field containing the identification code identifying the source of request in the invention of Glawitsch in order to locate the vehicle as taught in Talmadge see Par. 0017.

Claims 5-6, 87-88, 133-136, 203-206, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by US Patent 6772334 to Glawitsch in view of US Patent 5216675 to Melliar-Smith et al.(hereinafter Smith) further in view of US Patent 2003/0076794 A1 to Kawasaki et al.(hereinafter Kawasaki).

Regarding Claim 5-6, 87-88, 133-137, 157-158, 203-206, Glawitsch nor Smith disclose the transforming of user identifier and source identifier to be included in the header of the packet; additionally the transformation occurring as a CRC algorithm. However, Kawasaki discloses the transforming of source address and translation id being used see Fig. 10 item "translated source/destination address" & "translation ID"; the transformation using CRC algorithm see Fig. 5. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include transformation using CRC

of source identifiers and user identifiers in the invention of Glawitsch in order to have an secure communication between two entities using an known table as taught in Kawasaki see Fig. 6.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 7-13, 15, 89-95, 97, 131, 159-165, 167, 201, 207, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In summary, prior art is deficient in disclosing the key index being appended to the headers. And the Examiner has interpreted the key index as an array containing pointers that are associated with the key value see Par. 0097 of pending published application. And there are multiple such key indexes, for session keys and general keys, when the claims recite first key index it is referring to one of the mentioned keys.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkat Perungavoor whose telephone number is 571-272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron

can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Venkat Perungavoor  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2132

VP  
12/28/2006

  
GILBERTO BARRON JR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100